



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/893,706	06/29/2001	Saburou Ikeda	F-11500	5839		
466	7590	06/30/2008	EXAMINER			
YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
3628						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
06/30/2008		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2
3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte SABUROU IKEDA*
9

10
11 Appeal 2007-4043
12 Application 09/893,706
13 Technology Center 3600
14

15
16 Decided: June 30, 2008
17

18
19 *Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, and*
20 *HUBERT C. LORIN, Administrative Patent Judges.*

21
22 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*
23

24
25 DECISION ON APPEAL
26

27 STATEMENT OF CASE

28 Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection
29 of claims 1 to 20 and 23. Claims 21 and 22 have been canceled. We have
30 jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

31 Appellant invented an electronic toll payment system for a highway
32 toll and a transportation management system (Specification 1).

1 Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

2 1. A toll payment system which comprises:
3 a portable telephone on a car of a contractor of electronic toll
4 payment service;
5 base stations connected with said portable telephone;
6 and
7 a server connected with said base stations,
8 wherein said server comprises:
9 a first memory for storing locations of said base stations;
10 a second memory for storing names of contractors or their car
11 numbers and unit toll for each section along a highway;
12 a driving route identification unit for identifying a driving route of
13 said portable telephone on the basis of said locations of said base
14 station which are connected with said portable telephone;
15 a toll calculation unit for calculating a toll on the basis of said
16 unit toll and the identified driving route; and
17 a toll charging unit for charging said portable telephone the
18 calculated toll.

19
20 The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C.

21 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Treyz in view of Hassett.

22 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on
23 appeal is:

24 Hassett	US 6,653,946 B1	Nov. 25, 2003
25 Treyz	US 6,711,474 B1	Mar. 23, 2004

26
27 Appellant contends that Treyz does not disclose a second memory for
28 storing names of contractors or their car numbers.

29 Appellant also contends that Hassett does not disclose a toll
30 calculation unit for calculating a toll on the basis of the unit toll that serves
31 plural vehicles.

32

1

ISSUES

2 The first issue is whether the Appellant has shown that the Examiner
3 erred in finding that Treyz discloses a second memory for storing names of
4 contractors or their car numbers.

5 The second issue is whether the Appellant has shown that the
6 Examiner in finding that Hassett discloses a toll calculation unit for
7 calculating a toll on the basis of the unit toll that serves plural vehicles.

8

9

FINDINGS OF FACT

10 Treyz discloses a toll payment system which comprises a portable
11 telephone, which is part of a personal computer 14, in a car of a person who
12 has contracted for toll services (col. 45, ll. 50 to 54; col. 54, ll. 46 to 52).

13 Base stations 56 are connected with the personal computer 14 (col. 11, ll. 3
14 to 10). A server on the contractor's personal computer 14 is connected with
15 the base stations via a wireless connection (col. 17, l. 66 to col. 18, l. 3;
16 Figure 2). The server includes a first memory for storing locations of the
17 base stations (col. 11, ll. 51 to 56; col. 44, ll. 15 to 22). The server also
18 includes a second memory on a digital camera 170 (Figure 3). Treyz
19 discloses that the digital camera 170 is capable of capturing license plate
20 images and may be placed in any suitable location (col. 78, ll. 8 to 32).

21 Treyz discloses that tolls may be collected using the server (col. 54, ll. 31 to
22 52). A toll calculation unit at a toll collection facility for calculating the toll
23 and the identified driving route is implicit and certainly suggested by the
24 Treyz disclosure because the toll must be calculated before it is collected.

25 Hassett discloses a toll calculation unit for calculating a toll on the
26 basis of a unit toll and the identified route (col. 4, ll. 31 to 33).

1 ANALYSIS

2 We are not persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by the
3 Appellants argument that Treyz does not disclose a second memory for
4 storing names of contractors or their car numbers. Specifically, Appellants
5 argue that the digital computer disclosed in Treyz captures images of the
6 license plate of a car that may be tailgating the driver and thus the digital
7 computer does not store images of *contractors* or the car numbers or names
8 of the *contractors*.

9 We agree with the Examiner that the driver of the vehicle is a
10 contractor as broadly claimed because this person has entered into a contract
11 with the electronic payment service and that the license plate number of the
12 driver is a car number. In addition, we agree with the Examiner that the
13 memory of the digital camera is capable of storing the license plate number
14 of the drivers or contractors because the camera as disclosed can be placed
15 in any location which would include a location in which the driver's license
16 plate number can be captured.

17 We note that the phrase in claim 1 of "for storing names of contractors
18 or their car numbers" is a statement of intended use. The manner or method
19 in which a machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of
20 patentability of the machine itself. *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 580 (CCPA
21 1967). A statement of intended use does not qualify or distinguish the
22 structural apparatus claimed over the reference. *In re Sinex*, 309 F.2d 488,
23 492 (CCPA 1962). There is an extensive body of precedent on the question
24 of whether a statement in a claim of purpose or intended use constitutes a
25 limitation for purposes of patentability. See generally *Kropa v. Robie*,

1 187 F.2d 150, 155-59 (CCPA 1951) and the authority cited therein, and
2 cases compiled in 2 *Chisum, Patents* § 8.06[1][d] (1991). Therefore, as the
3 digital camera of Treyz is capable of storing the car license numbers of the
4 driver, Treyz meets this limitation of claim 1.

5 We are also not persuaded by Appellant's argument that Hassett does
6 not disclose a toll calculation unit for calculating a toll on the basis of the
7 unit toll that serves plural vehicles. Firstly, as Treyz discloses that a toll
8 charge can be collected through the system, a toll calculation unit is implicit
9 and certainly suggested by the Treyz disclosure alone. In addition, Treyz is
10 being relied on for teaching a toll payment system that serves plural
11 vehicles. Hassett is relied on for specifically teaching a toll calculation unit
12 for calculating a toll on the basis of unit toll and identified driving route.

13 We are likewise not persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by
14 Appellant's arguments that Hassett does not disclose collection of tolls using
15 a portable telephone or that Treyz does not disclose how the tolls are
16 calculated, because the rejection is based on the combined teachings of
17 Hassett and Treyz. In this regard, Treyz teaches collecting tolls using a
18 portable telephone, and Hassett discloses that the tolls are collected based on
19 the unit toll and identified driving route.

1 In view of the foregoing, we will sustain the Examiner's rejection as it
2 is directed to claim 1. We will also sustain the Examiner's rejection as it is
3 directed to claims 2 to 20 and 23 because the Appellant has not argued the
4 separate patentability of these claims.

5 The decision of the Examiner is affirmed.

6 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with
7 this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

8

AFFIRMED

10

11

12

13

14

15 hh

16

17 YOUNG & THOMPSON
18 209 Madison Street
19 Suite 500
20 ALEXANDRIA, VA 2231